

DEPARTMENT OF LABOR**Employment and Training
Administration**

[TA-W-58,184]

**Georgia-Pacific Corporation,
Consumer Products Division, Green
Bay, WI; Amended Certification
Regarding Eligibility To Apply for
Worker Adjustment Assistance and
Alternative Trade Adjustment
Assistance**

In accordance with section 223 of the Trade Act of 1974 (19 U.S.C. 2273) the Department of Labor issued a Certification of Eligibility To Apply for Worker Adjustment Assistance and Alternative Trade Adjustment Assistance on November 21, 2005, applicable to workers of Georgia-Pacific Corporation, Consumer Products Division, Green Bay, Wisconsin. The notice was published in the **Federal Register** on December 15, 2005 (70 FR 74368).

At the request of the State agency, the Department reviewed the certification for workers of the subject firm. The workers are engaged in the production of napkins, towels and tissue and are not separately identifiable by product line.

New findings show that there was a previous certification, TA-W-55,156, issued on August 12, 2004, for workers of Georgia-Pacific Corporation, Consumer Products Division, Green Bay, Wisconsin who were engaged in employment related to the production of napkins, towels and tissue. That certification expires August 12, 2006. To avoid an overlap in worker group coverage, the certification is being amended to change the impact date from October 12, 2004 to August 13, 2006, for workers of the subject firm.

The amended notice applicable to TA-W-58,184 is hereby issued as follows:

All workers of Georgia-Pacific Corporation, Consumer Products Division, Green Bay, Wisconsin, who became totally or partially separated from employment on or after August 13, 2006, through November 21, 2007, are eligible to apply for adjustment assistance under Section 223 of the Trade Act of 1974 and are also eligible to apply for alternative trade adjustment assistance under section 246 of the Trade Act of 1974.

Signed at Washington, DC, this 11th day of July 2006.

Elliott S. Kushner,*Certifying Officer, Division of Trade
Adjustment Assistance.*

[FR Doc. E6-12207 Filed 7-28-06; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4510-30-P**DEPARTMENT OF LABOR****Employment and Training
Administration**

[TA-W-59,554]

**Georgia Pacific Corporation, Mason
Street Operations, Green Bay, WI;
Notice of Termination of Investigation**

Pursuant to section 221 of the Trade Act of 1974, an investigation was initiated on June 13, 2006 in response to a petition filed by a company official on behalf of workers at Georgia Pacific Corporation, Mason Street Operations, Green Bay, Wisconsin (TA-W-59,554).

The petitioner has requested that the petition be withdrawn. Consequently, further investigation in this case would serve no purpose, and the investigation has been terminated.

Signed in Washington, DC, this 10th day of July, 2006.

Linda G. Poole,*Certifying Officer, Division of Trade
Adjustment Assistance.*

[FR Doc. E6-12205 Filed 7-28-06; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4510-30-P**DEPARTMENT OF LABOR****Employment and Training
Administration**

[TA-W-59,436]

**Jacquard, LLC, Burlington House
Division, Cliffside, NC; Notice of
Affirmative Determination Regarding
Application for Reconsideration**

By letter dated June 26, 2006, a petitioner requested administrative reconsideration of the Department of Labor's Notice of Negative Determination Regarding Eligibility to Apply for Worker Adjustment Assistance, applicable to workers of the subject firm. The denial notice was signed on June 13, 2006, and is pending publication in the **Federal Register**.

The initial investigation resulted in a negative determination based on the finding that the subject firm did not separate or threaten to separate a significant number or proportion of workers as required by section 222 of the Trade Act of 1974. Significant number or proportion of the workers in a firm or appropriate subdivision thereof, means that at least three workers with a workforce of fewer than 50 workers or five percent of the workers with a workforce of 50 or more.

The Department reviewed the request for reconsideration and has determined that the petitioner has provided additional information. Therefore, the

Department will conduct further investigation to determine if the workers meet the eligibility requirements of the Trade Act of 1974.

Conclusion

After careful review of the application, I conclude that the claim is of sufficient weight to justify reconsideration of the Department of Labor's prior decision. The application is, therefore, granted.

Signed at Washington, DC, this 20th of July 2006.

Elliott S. Kushner,*Certifying Officer, Division of Trade
Adjustment Assistance.*

[FR Doc. E6-12200 Filed 7-28-06; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4510-30-P**DEPARTMENT OF LABOR****Employment and Training
Administration**

[TA-W-58,808]

**Lexmark International, Inc., Supply
Chain Workforce, Printing Solutions &
Services Division, Lexington, KY;
Notice of Negative Determination on
Reconsideration**

On April 13, 2006, the Department issued an Affirmative Determination Regarding Application for Reconsideration for the workers and former workers of Lexmark International, Inc., Supply Chain Workforce, Printing Solutions & Services Division, Lexington, Kentucky (subject firm). The Notice was published in the **Federal Register** on April 24, 2006 (71 FR 21042).

The subject workers are engaged in product planning, purchasing of components, support and engineering, logistics, operations, and vendor relations.

In the initial investigation, the Department had determined that although production occurred within the firm or appropriate subdivision, the subject workers do not directly support this production. The Department had also found that the predominant cause of worker separations was Lexmark International, Inc.'s decision to position tasks to other domestic locations in order to be closer to their production partners and customers, who are located worldwide.

Workers of Lexmark International, Inc., Lexington, Kentucky were certified as eligible to apply for Trade Adjustment Assistance (TAA) on February 12, 2002 (TA-W-40,395) based on increased company imports of printers and inkjet cartridges.

In the request for reconsideration, the petitioner asserts that the subject workers supported the production of components (ink) of articles produced by the subject firm (ink and printer cartridges) and that their support functions were shifted abroad when cartridge production shifted abroad.

New information provided by the subject firm during the reconsideration investigation supports the finding that the subject workers purchased ink components which were used in the ink that was inserted into the ink cartridges which were used in the printers produced by the subject firm. As such, the workers are an integral part of ink and printer cartridge production.

Under the statute, the subject worker group must be employed by a firm (or an appropriate subdivision) which produced an article domestically during the twelve month period prior to the petition date. During the reconsideration investigation, the Department confirmed that neither the subject firm nor Lexmark International, Inc. produced ink or cartridges domestically during the relevant period.

Therefore, the Department determines that the subject workers are not employed by a company covered by the statute and are not eligible to apply for TAA.

In addition, in accordance with section 246 of the Trade Act of 1974 (26 U.S.C. 2813), as amended, the Department herein presents the results of its investigation regarding certification of eligibility to apply for ATAA for older workers.

In order for the Department to issue a certification of eligibility to apply for ATAA, the subject worker group must be certified eligible to apply for TAA. Since the subject workers are denied eligibility to apply for TAA, they cannot be certified eligible for ATAA.

Conclusion

After review of the application and investigative findings, I conclude that there has been no error or misinterpretation of the law or of the facts which would justify revision of the Department of Labor's prior decision. Accordingly, the application is denied.

Signed at Washington, DC, this 19th day of July 2006.

Elliott S. Kushner,

Certifying Officer, Division of Trade Adjustment Assistance.

[FR Doc. E6-12196 Filed 7-28-06; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4510-30-P

DEPARTMENT OF LABOR

Employment and Training Administration

[TA-W-58,859]

Midland Prints and Fabrics, Inc., Stenfield, NC; Affirmative Determinations for Worker Adjustment Assistance and Alternative Trade Adjustment Assistance; Correction

This notice rescinds the notice of certification of eligibility to apply for Alternative Trade Adjustment Assistance applicable to TA-W-58,859, which was published in the **Federal Register** on April 12, 2006 (71 FR 18771-18773) in FR Document E6-5369, Billing Code 4510-30-P.

This rescinds the certification of eligibility for workers of TA-W-58,859, to apply for Alternative Trade Adjustment Assistance and confirms eligibility to apply for Worker Adjustment Assistance as identified on page 18771 in the third column, the eleventh TA-W-number listed.

The Department appropriately published in the **Federal Register** April 12, 2006, page 18773, under the notice of Negative Determinations for Alternative Trade Adjustment Assistance, the denial of eligibility applicable to workers of TA-W-58,859. The notice appears on page 18773 in the first column, the second TA-W-number listed.

Signed in Washington, DC, this 24th day of July 2006.

Erica R. Cantor,

Director, Division of Trade Adjustment Assistance.

[FR Doc. E6-12190 Filed 7-28-06; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4510-30-P

DEPARTMENT OF LABOR

Employment and Training Administration

[TA-W-58,929]

Milprint, Inc., a Division of Bemis Company, Denmark, WI; Notice of Negative Determination on Reconsideration

On May 10, 2006, the Department issued an Affirmative Determination Regarding Application for Reconsideration for the workers and former workers of the subject firm. The Notice was published in the **Federal Register** on May 17, 2006 (71 FR 28712). The workers produce flexible plastic packaging, used largely in confectionary and snack food markets, and paper for

packaging cigarettes. Workers are not separately identifiable by product line.

The petition for Trade Adjustment Assistance (TAA) and Alternative Trade Adjustment Assistance (ATAA) filed on behalf of the workers of Milprint, Inc., A Division of Bemis Company, Denmark, Wisconsin (subject firm) was denied because the subject firm neither imported flexible plastic packaging or cigarette paper, nor shifted production of either article abroad during the relevant period. The investigation also revealed that the parent firm experienced increased sales of articles like or directly competitive with those produced by the subject facility during the investigatory period.

The petitioners had also filed as workers of a secondarily-affected company (supplied component parts for articles produced by a firm with a currently TAA-certified worker group). In the initial determination, the Department stated that the subject facility does not supply cigarette paper component parts to any TAA-certified firm in the relevant time period and that flexible plastic packaging is not a component part of confectionaries.

In the request for reconsideration, the United Steel Workers, Local 7-1203 (Union) stated that cigarette packaging paper constituted ten percent of subject firm production and that it was supplied to a TAA-certified firm, P.H. Gladfether, Neenah, Wisconsin (TA-W-53,612). The Union also stated that flexible plastic packaging constituted ninety percent of subject firm production and that this article was supplied to TAA-certified companies: Farley's and Sather Candy (TA-W-51,546), Archibald Candy (TA-W-53,983), American Safety Razor (TA-W-57,323), and Bob's Candy (TA-W-57,772).

To be certified as a secondarily-affected company, the subject firm must have a customer with a currently TAA-certified worker group and the subject firm produces a component part of the product that was the basis for the customer's certification. In addition, the TAA-certified customer must account for at least twenty percent of subject firm's sales or production or the loss of business with the customer contributed importantly to the workers' separations.

According to the Union, cigarette paper production constituted only ten percent of subject firm production. Even if P.H. Gladfether, Neenah, Wisconsin was the subject firm's only customer of this product, sales to P.H. Gladfether would have accounted for less than twenty percent of overall sales or production of the subject firm. Further, P.H. Gladfether, Neenah, Wisconsin was